

Rushmere St Andrew Neighbourhood Plan

Parish Council response to Examiner's Questions and Regulation 16 Consultation Comments

Examiner's Question	Parish Council Response
<p>Policy RSA3 - Protection of Landscape Character and Important Views Would the second element of the policy be more appropriately-worded if it required development proposals to respond positively to the identified important views rather than to avoid any detrimental impact?</p>	<p>While it is a reasonable ambition to seek a positive response to important views, we recognise that new development may not always be able to achieve this and that, at the very least, development should not have a detrimental impact on the key features of identified views.</p>
<p>Policy RSA6 - Local Green Spaces Should the wording used include commentary about the policy implications of local green space designation?</p>	<p>The Parish Council is aware that made neighbourhood plan policies on Local Green Spaces vary in what is stated about the implications of their designation. We are aware that other neighbourhood plans have included the wording "Development proposals within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances" and the Parish Council is happy that the Examiner may wish to propose this modification.</p>
<p>Policy RSA9 - Design Considerations The second paragraph of the policy correctly takes a proportionate approach. Is this approach also intended to apply to the application of the various criteria in the third part of the policy?</p>	<p>It is the intent that a proportionate approach is taken to the various criteria in the third part of the policy. On reflection, it might be appropriate to amend the opening line to: "In addition, and as appropriate to their scale, nature and location, proposals will be supported where:"</p>
<p>Policy RSA10 - Parish Services and Facilities Is the added value of this policy intended to be the identification of the services and facilities in the neighbourhood area to which Policy SCL8.1 of the Local Plan would apply?</p>	<p>The Parish Council can confirm that this is the intent of the Policy.</p>
<p>Policy RSA 11 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Would the final element of the policy be more positively-worded if it required development proposals for floodlighting to safeguard/ take account of any adjacent residential development rather than commenting on a specific outcome in the development management process?</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees that the final element of the policy is not positively worded. The issue with the sports grounds is that the impact of current floodlighting has a wider than adjoining residential properties and can be seen from the open countryside to the north and east when in operation. It is agreed that an amendment to support development proposals which demonstrate that there would be no light spill to adjacent residential properties and the wider area might be more appropriate.</p> <p>The Parish Council does not wish to propose alternative wording and is for the Examiner to propose wording should it be considered necessary.</p>

Comments on Regulation 16 Representations

Respondent	Parish Council Response
East Suffolk District Council	<p>The District Council has made a significant number of detailed comments on paragraphs and policies. We are aware that the Examiner needs to ensure that the Plan, with any recommended amendments that he might make, needs to meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>It will, therefore, be for the Examiner to determine whether amendments to policies are required to meet the Basic Conditions. However, we do not believe that all the District Council's suggested amendments to policies are necessary in order for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The District Council has raised concerns about the accuracy of the Policies Map. However, we would point to other made neighbourhood plans in the District, such as Bredfield, where less detailed mapping has been used to identify designations and which have not raised any comments from the District Council. We are therefore satisfied that the maps in the Neighbourhood Plan are fit for purpose.</p>
Historic England	Nothing further to add
Ipswich School (Boyer Planning)	<p>This is a lengthy representation and the Parish Council limits its comments on policy matters.</p> <p>Policy RSA1 – Planning Strategy It is unclear from the representation as to whether the request is to add reference to Local Plan Policy SCLP12.22 into Policy RSA1 and/or the separate policy reference box. Either way, it is not considered necessary to make this amendment in order to meet the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Policy RSA3 - Protection of Landscape Character and Important Views The representation suggests that the Policy "should not just focus on the 'Important View' but should instead reflect the landscape character of the Neighbourhood Plan area." Criterion i. of the Policy does just this.</p> <p>Policy RSA5 – Settlement Gaps The Parish Council is of the opinion that the Policy meets the Basic Conditions and does accord with Policy SCLP12.22. The consideration of settlement gaps and the consideration of development on sports pitches are two distinct matters. Development related to sports pitches, such as clubhouses, changing facilities and spectator facilities or car parking can erode the effectiveness of a settlement gap and Policy RSA5 addresses how such proposals might be considered.</p> <p>Policy RSA9 – Design Considerations No comment</p> <p>Policy RSA10 - Parish Services and Facilities Proposals It is not considered necessary to include reference to Policy SCLP12.22 in Policy RSA10.</p> <p>Policy RSA11 – Open Space, Sport, and Recreation Facilities</p>

	<p>The Parish Council has responded to the Examiner's question concerning floodlighting earlier in this statement.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include reference to Policy SCLP12.22 in Policy RSA11.</p> <p>Policies Maps – North and in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>The Policies Map does not have to repeat the content of the Local Plan but illustrate the extent of designations made by policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is not considered necessary to include reference to Policy SCLP12.22 on the Policies Map.</p> <p>Other considerations</p> <p>The Parish Council notes the comments concerning land off Humber Doucy Lane. The future use of this land is a matter for the relevant local planning authorities when reviewing their local plans. There is no requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to say anything about its future use.</p>
Kesgrave Town Council	The comments of the Town Council are noted. Whilst it is acknowledged that the Town Council does not wish to see development further coalesce the two settlements, it must be acknowledged that future local plan reviews could well look at further northern expansion of the built-up area of Kesgrave. This might, even though it's in Playford parish, result in further coalescence and loss of important countryside. The Vision (which is not a planning policy) seeks to prevent this.
National Highways	No comment
Natural England	No comment
Suffolk County Council	The Parish Council addressed many of the County Council's comments at the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission consultation stage and has nothing further to add.
Suffolk Wildlife Trust	The Parish Council notes the support for Policies RSA3 and RSA4. The suggested amendments to Policy RSA4 are not considered necessary to meet the Basic Conditions but respect that the Examiner will have the ultimate decision on these matters.
Comments on late responses	
Environment Agency	The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose a further extension of the Cemetery
Ministry of Defence	No comment